

# ***PBEEEP***

## ***State Government***

**Public Buildings Enhanced Energy Efficiency Program**

### **SCREENING RESULTS FOR MINNESOTA STATE COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE DETROIT LAKES**



**Date: 6/14/2010**



## **1.0 Screening Summary**

**Table A: Site Summary**

<b>Facility Name</b>	<b>M State Detroit Lakes</b>
Location	900 Hwy 34 East Detroit Lakes, MN 56501
Facility Manager	Bruce Hurt
Number of Buildings	7
Interior Square Footage	191,824
PBEEEP Provider	CEE (Neal Ray)
Date Visited	May 5, 2010
State Project Manager	Matt Sheppard
Annual Energy Cost	\$160,619 (2009)
Date Visited	Site not visited
Annual Energy Usage	1,356,666 kWh (electric) 16,517 Therms (natural gas)
Utility Company	City of Detroit Lakes (electricity), Minnesota Energy Resources (natural gas)
Site Energy Use Index (EUI)	34.1 kBtu/sq. ft.
Benchmark EUI (from B3)	103.4 kBtu/sq. ft.

**Table B: Building Summary**

<b>Building Name</b>	<b>State ID</b>	<b>Area (Square Feet)</b>
Section G	E26264T0775	58,370
Main A, B, D, E	E26264T0566	46,070
Section C & H	E26264T0993	40,000
Section F	E26264T0672	37,100
Outdoor Power/Marine Storage	E26264T0889	4,784
Food Storage	E26264T0466	2,800
Lund Building	E26264T0360	2,700

### **1.1 Recommendations:**

A detailed investigation of the energy usage and energy savings opportunities of the seven buildings at Minnesota Community and Technical College (M State) Detroit Lakes is not recommended at this time because of an existing Guaranteed Energy Savings Contract (GESG).

The GESG at M State Detroit Lakes covers lighting and heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment within the facility.

## **2.0 Minnesota State Community and Technical College Detroit Lakes Screening Overview**

M State Detroit Lakes is made up of seven buildings. The buildings range in size from 58,370 to 2,700 square feet. Before a site visit was performed, it was discovered that the facility was under a GESC. Due to the contract, the facility was not screened, and no information was gathered on the mechanical equipment in the building. Prior to the site visit, the utility usage information was reviewed in the MN Benchmarking Tool, B3. The review indicated there was an error present in units for the natural gas utility data entered. Much of the data appears to be entered in as 1000 cubic feet (MCF). The data should be edited to reflect units of Therms in order to match with the utility billing units.

The screening process is designed to determine the likelihood that an energy investigation will lead to a cost-effective project that produces energy savings. A full screening of the buildings at this facility was not conducted because of the GESC with Energy Services Group.

At this time, PBEEEP is unable to conduct a project at sites under a GESC for the following reasons:

- A. Contract obligations of the Agency:
  - i. A GESC may contractually bind activities affecting certain functions, attributes, or conditions of equipment and systems covered by the GESC.
- B. Claim of energy savings:
  - i. Savings generated from the PBEEEP project are supposed to service the lease purchase financing agreement and once those obligations are complete, go directly to the Agency. If a GESC agreement exists, the full savings generated through PBEEEP may be affected and may not be available for servicing the lease purchase loan or to go directly to the Agency after the loan term is completed.
- C. Cost effectiveness for the Agency:
  - i. PBEEEP is structured on the ability to couple longer payback items with shorter payback items. In the case of a GESC, the major energy saving opportunities or low cost/no cost opportunities most likely have been identified and implemented which leaves no opportunity to fund longer payback measures. In this case, the PBEEEP project may not be cost effective as a supplement to an existing GESC. Therefore the costs to conduct the project as compared to the savings opportunities identified may not be cost effective for the Agency.

Since the GESC at M State Detroit Lakes covers lighting and HVAC and is not expected to expire until 2019, the building is not recommended for PBEEEP at this time.